DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 067 PS 021 037

AUTHOR Hewes, Dorothy W.
TITLE Pestalozzi: Foster Father of Early Childhood Education.
PUB DATE 12 Nov 92
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the National Association for the Education of Young Children History Seminar (New Orleans, LA, November 12, 1992).
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Early Childhood Education; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Theories; *Kindergarten; *Locus of Control; Progressive Education; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Froebel (Friedrich); *Pestalozzi (Johann Heinrich)

ABSTRACT

In tracing the spread of the educational philosophy of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, it is useful to understand educators' emphasis on an internal or external locus of control. Pestalozzi was an individual with an internal locus of control, and this trait was reflected in his educational philosophy of self-learning and free investigation. However, educators who used Pestalozzi's system of education were individuals with both types of locus of control. Thus, although some systems based on Pestalozzi's ideas, such as Robert Owen's Utopian society, stressed internal control, most 19th century schools in the United States stressed external control and were authoritarian in their approach. In the middle of the 19th century, Friedrich Froebel's concept of the kindergarten, which incorporated ideas of Pestalozzi, was introduced from Germany into the United States, where Elizabeth Peabody adapted it into a teacher-directed system stressing external control. In contrast to Peabody and her followers, other educators brought to the American kindergarten movement a more authentic form of Pestalozzi's ideas that stressed internal control. By the end of the century, kindergarten advocates had been divided into groups with differing philosophies and kindergarten had lost its identification with Froebelian ideas. The methods of Pestalozzi and Froebel did not die out, however. They were incorporated into the Child Study Movement and the Progressive Education practices of John Dewey, and underlie current emphases on developmentally appropriate practice. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED353067

NAEYC History Seminar
New Orleans, Nov. 12, 1992

PESTALOZZI:

FOSTER FATHER OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Dorothy W. Hewes, Ph.D.
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182-0282

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dorothy W. Hewes
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 021037

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PESTALOZZI -
FOSTER FATHER OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

I have previously reviewed the history of Froebelian kindergartens in the United States, their slow start during the 1870s, their rapid spread during the 1880s as privately funded institutions, and their sudden great proliferation as the beginning level of public schools during the 1890s (Hewes, 1975, 1985). I have also traced the evolution of kindergarten teacher preparation as it evolved from an informal apprenticeship system during the 1870s to Froebelian training schools the following decade, and I have documented the assimilation of kindergarten teacher training into normal schools late in the nineteenth century (Hewes, 1990). Two years ago, in this NAEYC History Seminar, I attributed the proliferation of commercial school materials developed during the late 1800s to the failure of normal schools to inculcate their students with the authentic Froebelian philosophy and to the great increase in class size when public schools tried to cut kindergarten costs (Hewes, 1991).

As I've written and spoken about kindergarten history, I have been intrigued with the distortions that always seem to occur during the transmission of educational systems. Their alterations over time and through geographic space often resemble that old game of telephone. Remember how the message got whispered down the line from one child to another and the resulting statement was often something completely different? I've had many questions. For example, why have kindergartens varied so much from the original models in some places and remained so consistently Froebelian in others? Where have leaders and administrators gotten their ideas and how did they themselves alter the environments for children? If a culture structures the education of its children to fit into a model desired by their society, what will changes be as we make a transition under President Clinton? And, like so many others who teach those who will become teachers of young children, I have asked myself why a few of my former students have diverged so far from what I thought they were learning! I have been searching for some

system that could be used to help explain and visualize how and why these changes occur.

Before I delve into my proposed system, however, let me first explain why I called Pestalozzi the "foster father" of the kindergarten. We are all familiar with foster family placement. When children are abandoned, neglected, or mistreated, they live in a nurturing foster home. What I intend to trace is a philosophy of early childhood education that was abandoned, neglected and mistreated early in the nineteenth century. Then, after foster care for about fifty years, it was adopted under a different name. The "conception" of this philosophy came early in the 1800s with publication in the United States of Pestalozzian writings and visits of educators to his Swiss schools. "Infant schools" of the late 1820s and early 1830s represent the "birth" and "infancy" of a humanistic ideology. Although these first early childhood programs disappeared from view, the philosophy didn't die out. It was moved into a foster home, since a few of their younger enthusiasts were still around in the 1870s to welcome Froebel's kindergarten and some of the infant classes became the entry level of public schools. By that time, also, many elementary and college teachers had been educated in American Pestalozzian schools or had been influenced by his philosophy, which not only shifted public perceptions about schooling for older students but predisposed communities to support the immature kindergarten movement. I propose, then, that if Froebel can be called the father of the kindergarten, it seems equally appropriate for Pestalozzi to be the foster father.

However, I have also chosen Pestalozzi as a model for my proposed system that traces the spread of an educational philosophy by analyzing it in terms of *locus of control*. Social psychologist Julian Rotter, who introduced the concept in 1954, explains that "internal versus external control refers to the degree to which persons expect that a reinforcement or an outcome of their behavior is contingent upon their own behavior or personal characteristics versus the degree to which persons expect that the reinforcement or outcome is a function of chance, luck, or fate, is under the control of powerful others, or is simply unpredictable" (Rotter, 1990, p. 489). In other words, people who consistently believe that they are in control of their own lives, who

believe that they can make a difference with their own actions, are said to have an internal locus of control and are termed Internals. They actively seek new information and they creatively reach unique conclusions. Those who attribute control to outside forces are said to have an external locus of control and are called Externals. They tend not to take action or to make changes, but they expect immediate results when they do. They prefer firm laws or policies, with firm punishments for those who violate them, and have been studied in the context of totalitarian political systems. For convenience, psychologists writing about these expectancies often abbreviate them to IE or refer to IE dimensions.

Involvement in social action, ability to creatively imagine future possibilities, and resistance to influence are among the many variables currently being investigated by IE theorists (Strickland, 1989). I am proposing that we can also apply IE terminology to the analysis of educational systems or educational philosophers. The structuring of environments and the discipline techniques used in programs for young children may cause them to develop personality characteristics and ways of approaching life that would be clustered toward one end or the other of an IE scale. I visualize this ten point scale as having a value neutral mid-point, where "ideal" educational systems would be located, with the five points on each side indicating by plus signs the degree to which the system is designed to produce Internals or Externals. Only a few isolated examples, primarily short-lived experiments or home schooling, could be placed on the extreme end of the I or Internal scale, where I would give them a rating of I++++++ to indicate five points. On the opposite end of the scale, however, it is easy to find control-oriented systems that are authoritarian, whose goal is to produce citizens willing to accept domination by divine edict or by secular public officials. Schools of Puritan Boston would rate E++++ on the scale because their interlocking parent-church-education system was deliberately designed to develop docile children who would grow up obedient to the will of their Puritan God (Hewes, 1989).

Philosophies at the value neutral mid-point of the model would encourage individuality and strong self-esteem but would balance this with a concern for the welfare of others and a need to conform to the requirements of the culture and the natural world. Giving them a mid-

point rating means an averaging out of the curriculum activities, some of which could appropriately be quite authoritarian and others quite self-directed. Mid-point systems would incorporate adult-guided learning responses to individual needs (even in newborn babies) but would be designed to encourage development of social skills and cooperation, together with self-reliance and self-determination. Constructivism, the Piaget-based system now popular in early childhood education, would be a contemporary example. Froebel's kindergarten of the 1830s and 40s was designed to produce this balance of Internal and External personality traits. This paper shows that a similar approach proposed by Pestalozzi for older children fostered and developed an educational system with a balanced I-E locus of control and paved the way for the kindergarten in the United States.

It must be emphasized that placement in this continuum is based upon the results expected through the system. The Montessori Method, for example, was so rigid in its prescribed use of didactic materials that it might be given a high E rating. On the other hand, it allowed so much freedom of choice that it might be scored high on the I side of the continuum. However, since it was carefully based upon what Montessori saw as the "special laws and vital necessities which cannot be forgotten if we are aiming at health for mankind," the system was designed to cultivate and protect the inner activities of the child (Montessori 1966. p. 117). Montessori believed that children without any organization in their environment wasted their efforts and failed to accomplish their potentials, so she provided freedom within structure as a means of developing adults with a strong Internal capacity who were able to accept External societal controls. Therefore, using this scale, the educational concept advanced by Maria Montessori would be close to the midpoint I-E score, perhaps E+.

Pestalozzi's System

Who was Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, and why was he chosen for such a case study? He was born in Switzerland in 1746, during a period of extended warfare and unrest in central Europe and of deep philosophical discussions about the meaning of life. Even though he remained there until his death in 1827, he was influential because so

many educators from Europe and America visited his school in Yverdun and took his revolutionary ideas back home (Binder, 1974). Pestalozzi went from one position to another, usually unsuccessfully and with only a public high school education, but always working with children, observing them, and forming his ideas about how they should be educated. He was a notably poor administrator. One friend wrote in 1773 that "Pestalozzi carried a very heavy burden; he has no method in anything" (Pinloche, 1901, p 17). Throughout these years, however, he provided inspiration and a series of publications extolling the virtues of teaching through sense perception and without harsh discipline. "The greatest lesson that Pestalozzi taught is embodied in the word love," wrote Seeley in 1904 (p. 271).

Although Pestalozzi wrote very little about out-of-home early childhood education, much of what he advocated was applicable for any age, as indicated by statements like one he made in 1801 that "To instruct is . . . to help nature develop in its own way, and the art of instruction depends primarily on harmonizing our messages, and the demands we make upon the child, with his powers at the moment." The first principle of good education, he declared, is that "if a man is to become what he ought to be, he must be as a child, and do as a child, what makes him happy as a child" (1951, p. 103). Pestalozzi is usually considered to be the modern educator who most influenced his contemporaries and the public attitudes about classrooms in which the children and the teacher both initiate and respond. He taught without books, chiefly outdoors with natural materials, but he objected to the Socratic question-and-answer method being used in some experimental schools because it attempted to draw information from children before they had acquired basic knowledge. He therefore recommended introductory dictation by the teacher and repetition by the students, including the introduction of new terminology and oral phonics without seeing print (Cubberly, 1920, p. 448). Only after children were acquainted with fundamentals, Pestalozzi stressed, will sense-perception and original explorations into knowledge be verified by each child's own understanding of problems and solutions. (1827, p. 8)

Pestalozzi was so strongly an Internal that he claimed, late in life, to have not read a book in thirty years because he didn't want to be

influenced by the thoughts of others. Perhaps it was merely because he couldn't afford printed materials, but he recommended that teachers also avoid books so that they remain open to a better understanding of their students and that they not rely on them for teaching children (Pinloche, 1901). Although he combined self-learning and free investigation with an authoritarian or External style and his program sometimes seemed to border on chaos, my ranking of him would be on the Internal side of the scale, probably I++. It must be kept in mind, however, that some of the teachers in his school at Yverdun were much farther to both left and right and that he was apparently uninterested in changing their style or unable to do so. Many who left, either in disgust at his ineffectual leadership or because they were convinced that their own versions of the method were superior, became recognized as Pestalozzian authorities in other countries.

British Pestalozzians

Three English educators who studied with Pestalozzi illustrate how contrasting interpretations were passed on in an international game of telephone to the Americans. James Greaves had been a wealthy merchant before losing his fortune in the Napoleonic wars. Although he had no official position, Greaves made himself useful in Yverdon for about ten years. He then returned to England to establish infant schools for children aged three to seven which he based upon Pestalozzi's program at a Swiss orphanage. Greaves appears to have caught those aspects of the system which develop an Internal Locus of Control; he understood Pestalozzi's intent to have supportive and interactive initiation and response between teacher and pupils, and was able to direct a program based upon affection and mutual respect. Greaves was a benevolent and concerned individual without a great deal of drive and business sense. His contribution to posterity came in 1825 when he volunteered to serve as secretary of the Infant School Society in London. At his request, Pestalozzi wrote thirty-four Letters on the Early Education of the Child that were translated into English for publication in 1827 and republished in Boston three years later They remain our major source of information about what Pestalozzi actually believed about early education.

In contrast, another English devotee was Charles Mayo, who was travelling in Switzerland in 1819 and casually dropped in at the Yverdon school for a couple of hours. He stayed for three years. (Cubberly, 1920, p. 445) He seems to have caught the regimentation of the preliminary dictation/recitation related to the object lessons but not the importance attached to having children individually manipulate and discover with them. Back in England, he opened a boys school which was successful until his death thirty years later. Mayo's greatest influence, however, was because he shared information about Pestalozzi with his sister. Elizabeth Mayo taught at the boys school until she became superintendent of the Home and Colonial Training College when it opened in London in 1836. Its goal was to train teachers in Pestalozzian methods, but they were definitely not trained in the haphazard observational way of his Swiss school. Elizabeth Mayo and her assistant, Margaret Jones, efficiently prepared model lessons of dictation and oral response, including some for the infant schools that were becoming so popular for children under the age of six. What happened in England was typical of what happens to many child-oriented educational systems. The English manuals were studied by adults who then told children what they were expected to know. The college did, however, advocate a nurturant and gentle type of education, a great improvement over the punitive discipline then prevalent and one that enabled women to be teachers because brute strength was less needed. The Home and Colonial Training College was designed to develop an External locus of control and is rated E+++.

A third widely known Pestalozzian program was established in 1816 as an infant school attached to Robert Owen's cotton mills in Scotland. This earliest known example of employer sponsored day care was the outgrowth of Owen's own visit to Pestalozzi and his radical idea that children should not be employed until age ten. There apparently was no planned curriculum, but just a directive to treat the children kindly. Two years later, when one of his business friends established an Infant Asylum in London for the education of poor children, Owen sent his New Lanark teacher to take charge. James Buchanan was described as "a queer fish" and the sight of him was said to be enough to make most of the sponsors depart forever. He and his wife, for the munificent salary of two pennies a week, kept the children occupied with learning little verses and songs,

with lots of marching led by Buchanan and his flute. There is no indication that Buchanan had any sort of formal training or any Pestalozzian orientation, which may explain why he emigrated to South Africa in 1839 to become an elementary teacher (Vág, 1984). His infant school was so disorganized, with no specific philosophy or methodology, that it cannot be placed on my scale. It was simply "zoo care" for the benefit of impoverished families.

While still in England, however, Buchanan introduced the idea of infant schools to a clever entrepreneur named Samuel Wilderspin. He demonstrated that the route to success is to develop a cost-effective system with public appeal, publish widely, claim that the ideas of others are your own, and pose as the only expert. In 1823, Wilderspin wrote a letter to Owen to express his gratitude for this new level of education, but by 1829 he insisted that Owen really hadn't had infant schools. They were just places for working women to leave their babies, mere asylums with custodial care. By 1835, when there were about 300 infant schools with 20,000 pupils in the United Kingdom, Wilderspin testified before a government committee that he had not only coined the name but had started the first infant school in 1820. His book, On the Importance of Teaching the Infant Children of the Poor, indicates that, like Buchanan, he lacked any professional preparation. It relates that on the first day as a teacher he figured out the importance of keeping children quiet through a quick succession of absorbing activities - sort of a Sesame Street approach. Picking up on Pestalozzi's use of dictation and repetition to teach basic knowledge, Wilderspin developed and popularized galleries in which two hundred or so children could sit for their lessons - six-year-olds at the top and younger ones at the bottom. The stress was upon repeating words of the teachers. Wilderspin used the term psittiacism, derived from the Greek for parrot, to describe the mechanical repetition by which they learned. He wrote memory verses such as "Sixteen drams is just an ounce, As you'll find out at any shop, Sixteen ounces make a pound, If you should want a mutton chop." He did want children out in the open air part of the time, "choosing their own occupations and manifesting their characters," but the only toys seem to have been wooden blocks and rotary swings. (Raymont, 1937) Use of interesting activities to occupy children, rather than dependence upon

the punitive discipline then prevalent in education, is a redeeming feature of his schools and gives them a score of E+++.

These British systems, all based upon associations with Pestalozzi and observations of his school in Switzerland, have IE scores that range from Greaves on the Internal side with perhaps an I+++ to the Mayo program and Wilderspin's infant schools both scoring E+++. All three said that they were Pestalozzian and all three influenced educational practices across the Atlantic.

American Infant Schools

A few private infant schools based upon Pestalozzi's ideas were in existence in the early 1800s (Pence 1980), but the best known program opened in 1826 as an integral part of Robert Owen's Utopian socialist cooperative in New Harmony, Indiana. His educational expert was William Maclure, a Scotch geologist who had not only visited Pestalozzian schools in Europe but in 1804 had subsidized two Yverdon trained teachers, Joseph and Elise Neef, so they could establish themselves in the United States. For the two years that the colony was active, there was an infant school taught by Mrs. Neef and a Philadelphia Pestalozzian named Madame Frotegeot. As in many Utopias, the children were considered to be community property at age two and were encouraged both at home and in school to be socially cooperative but to be independent thinkers who took responsibility for their own actions. I rank it I++ because it was a joyous play school where young children learned games and had a variety of playthings, but where "they were taught nothing they could not understand" (Altfest, 1977).

American interest in this small experiment in Indiana meant that its influence was widespread. After the collapse of the New Harmony settlement in 1827, Neef remained active in teaching and writing until his death in 1854. (Monroe, 1907) Probably the most accurate account of what Pestalozzi really intended was Neef's 1808 book with a lengthy title, Sketch of a plan and method of education founded on an analysis of the human faculties and natural reason suitable for the offspring of a free people and for all rational beings. Neef wrote that the Pestalozzian pupil "always sets out from the known" and "proceeds with slow speediness to the yet unknown and complicated." Math was to be learned through

manipulation of easily moveable things such as beans, peas, little stones or marbles. For older children, geometry would be taught through models and drawings and grammar would be deduced through use of language. Books should not to be found in infant schools. (We might parenthetically note that this was before we had appropriate children's picture and story books - and that one reason they developed was to counter this Pestalozzian objection.)

Using metaphors very similar to those of Froebel, and in contrast to the "blank slate" concept that had been advanced by John Locke, Neef defined education as a gradual unfolding of the faculties and powers which Nature had bestowed on every human being. The newborn child contains the germs of these faculties just as the acorn contains the germs of the majestic oak, explained Neef. The work of a teacher is the unfolding of these powers - to train the child to make use of its faculties. This education would not proceed by jumps, starts, nor giant strides but would start out from the known and plain and move on to the yet unknown and complicated. No point would be left behind until thoroughly mastered. The acquisition of language and the communication of ideas, said Neef, are the basis of all elementary school training. Object teaching, the leading out of the child's ability to describe what has been observed, investigated, analyzed and determined about some natural part of the environment, would be primarily based upon the senses. A second source would be memory, and a third would be analogy. Books would be the last resource from which to draw knowledge. He also dealt with music, the study of languages, geography, and other school subjects.

Basic to the child's knowledge was nature study, the observation and investigation of all the stones, vegetables, plants, worms, insects and other things that children would find, and a school garden would be important in the curriculum. Bodily activity was encouraged, particularly outdoors in the open air. In a section which puts his ideas strongly on the I side of my scale, Neef wrote that most teachers would find that their magesterial dignity, authority, and infallibility would be wounded and outraged if pupils ventured to tell them that they were wrong, and that the daring little culprits would be punished and chastised so that they would not dare repeat that heinous crime. Instead, he asserted that

he required such students to tell him loudly that he was wrong. His version of Pestalozzi would rank about I++ on the scale.

The year Owen started his Utopian community, 1826, also saw the introduction of Infant Schools to Boston and other North Atlantic seacoast cities. Americans believed that these were Pestalozzian. In actuality, they reflected Wilderspin's one-sided approach. William Russell, new editor of The American Journal of Education, first published exerpts from Wilderspin's 1823 book. Then the entire book, and others based upon it, were used as guides. Both Pence (1980) and Winterer (1992) have emphasized the hope of well-meaning citizens that these Infant Schools would mean the salvation of poor children and of society in general and have detailed their rapid proliferation by 1830. Although there were some modifications, the general structure meant that children were passively learning to repeat words without the vaguest idea of what they were saying. 1830 marked the beginning of their decline, with Russell and other early advocates realizing their mistake. The publication of one of the letters Pestalozzi had written to Greaves, one in which he implied that mothers are the best educators for young children, came at a time when "family values" suddenly became an issue. At the same time, medical authorities claimed that forced education destroyed jelly-like young brains. While there were wide variations in their application of Wilderspin's authoritarian system in the American Infant Schools, I give them an E+++ score.

The Oneida Pestalozzians

As mentioned above, it was generally agreed that education for older children had changed in spirit because of the Infant Schools. Wilderspins's system, rigid though it was, accepted the humanity of children and tried to make the learning experience interesting for them. The general feeling seems to have been that there was great potential for learning in young children but that somehow it just didn't work out this time. Meanwhile, corporal punishment was routine. As an example of acceptable discipline in mid-century education, we need only to sample the list of "Lashes: Rules of Stokes County Academy: 1848" which includes:

Boys and Girls Playing Together, 4
Telling Lyes, 7
Making Swings and Swinging on them, 7
For not Making a bow when going out to go home, 2
For Not washing at playtime when going to Books, 4
Nick-naming each other, 4
For playing Bandy, 10.

(Douglas & Grieder, 1948, pp. 50-51)

Schools taught by men able to spend much of their time lashing children who broke rules would certainly rank high on the E scale. In general, these discipline met the approval of the parents and the clergy. In fact, many teachers were clergymen because they had free time and were literate enough to read the textbooks aloud so that children could memorize their contents. The idea of special preparation for teachers was scarcely recognized. Slowly changing attitudes about public education led to acceptance of normal schools and further progress came as a result of them (Hewes, 1990c). The teacher training program developed by Edward Austin Sheldon, Superintendent of Schools in Oswego, New York, was one of the first. Sheldon had a smoothly running elementary school system but complained that "the pupils didn't understand the why's of what they learned." On an 1859 trip to Toronto he found a museum display of materials used by the Home and Colonial School in London - a complete set of models, charts, objects and methods, complete with the manuals that had been developed by Elizabeth Mayo. He paid three hundred dollars for them, the equivalent of a third of his annual salary, and then persuaded Elizabeth Jones to come from Mayo's London training school for a year. This in-service training expanded to a regular normal school over the next several years, not only one of the first institutions in the country specifically designed to educate teachers for the burgeoning public elementary schools but one of the first institutions to professionalize teaching. The effect was cumulative, since many aspects of Oswego's Pestalozzian methodology became incorporated into the normal schools that soon were developed in every large city. (Rogers, 1961)

Routine physical punishment of students was replaced by Pestalozzian ideas of positive interactions, enabling women to teach in the rapidly expanding systems of public elementary schools. Most of them married and became mothers who applied his ideas to their own children's education. In an 1898 book about Oswego Normal School, Hollis detailed the rapid movement of both women and men graduates into administrative positions across the expanding nation, where they facilitated the adoption kindergartens into the public schools during the 1890s. Some actually called themselves Froebelians. For example, Earle Barnes became an influential Stanford University professor whose own students were Froebelian leaders and Mary Laing, class of 1874, established the Froebel Academy in Brooklyn and hired other Oswego graduates as teachers.

The version of Pestalozzi that was passed on to the Oswego students, despite the early influence of Elizabeth Mayo's object teaching model, was greatly modified by Sheldon and his colleagues. Rather than maintaining the E+++ score of the Mayo system, Oswego moved to what seems to be close to the value-neutral mid-point. Sheldon's guiding maxims included:

> Begin with the senses.
> Never tell a child what he can discover for himself.
> Love of variety is a law of childhood - change is rest.
> Let every lesson have a definite point.
> Proceed from the simple to the difficult, from the known to the unknown.
>
> (Rogers, 1961, p. 20)

With this orientation, it is not surprising that in 1881 Oswego became one of the first normal schools to provide a kindergarten training class. When it opened, there were about 300 kindergartens in the United States, including some in public schools, but teachers were informally trained through an apprentice system (Hewes, 1990). The first directors of the Oswego kindergarten program, Clara Burr and Amanda Funnelle, used Froebel's gifts and objects to give ideas of form, color, and size, but one of their graduates recalled that there was a great deal of flexibility One graduate later explained that Funnelle "felt that Froebel intended freedom, not rigid compliance." She added, "I was

shocked to discover later how slavishly others followed his teachings." (Rogers, 1961, p. 109). From accounts of this program, and because Hailmann's skillfully edited translation of Froebel's Education of Man was a primary text, I would consider that the Oswego kindergarten teachers would also fit into the value-neutral middle area of the IE scale.

In the United States, as in England and other countries, there were several different versions of Pestalozzi. One, in which the teacher initiated and the children responded, was based upon Elizabeth Mayo's idea of teacher models and the writings of Wilderspin and his spin-off Externals, considered to be E+++, while those following Neef seem to have prepared a mid-point learning environment in which both teachers and children had ample opportunities to initiate their own experiences.

The American Kindergartens

Froebel briefly visited Pestalozzi's school in 1805. He returned in 1808 to spend two years there while his pupils were enrolled as special students. Although he "soon saw much that was imperfect," he later spoke of this as "a glorious time." He wrote that Pestalozzi "set one's soul on fire for a higher and nobler life, though he had not made clear or sure the exact road towards it nor indicated the means whereby to attian it." (Downs, 1978, p. 23) In 1836, when he developed the idea of the kindergarten as the introductory phase of education, he incorporated Pestalozzi's ideas about play, nature study and music into a plan that drew upon the writings of Comenius, eastern religions, extensive correspondence, and his own observations during three decades of experimentation in his own boarding schools. Like Pestalozzi, Froebel saw the importance of parents as the first teachers, for careful sequencing of work to meet the abilities of young students, and the educative value of active self-education. Most important, however, was Froebel's faith in each child's ability to learn -- at a time when brutal punishment was often utilized to enforce rote memorization (Hewes, 1991b). His letters, particularly those translated by Heinemann (1893) indicate that his enthusiasm for this core concept never wavered. Early kindergartens struggled along in small German cities for a dozen years, with even members of his immediate family and staff not supporting him whole-heartedly, until the arrival in 1849 of an enthusiastic wealthy

widow who led what became the kindergarten crusade in Europe. In 1851, when Froebel was almost seventy years old, he married Luise Levin, who had been one of his student teachers. In that same year, the Prussian government prohibited all kindergartens and girls high schools on the pretense that they were socialistic and atheistic. Froebel, broken-hearted and discouraged, died the following spring. His widow and colleagues developed training programs and demonstration schools, tried to maintain the integrity of his pioneering ideas, and welcomed American visitors.

It is generally agreed that the Froebelian kindergarten was introduced into the United States by German immigrants fleeing the chaos surrounding their abortive 1848 revolution. The first one is usually attributed to Margarethe Schurz, whose class was held in her front parlor for her own daughers and their four cousins in 1856. According to the commonly accepted myth, the Schurz daughter Agathe so impressed Elizabeth Peabody that she became an immediate convert to Froebelism. Actually, Margarethe was at home in Waterton, Wisconsin, when Carl Shurz gave his 1859 talk on "True Americanism" in Boston - he wrote letters to her about the success of his lecture tour - and the story seems to have been concocted by Peabody many years later. What appears to have happened is that Peabody and Carl Schurz had a conversation and he asked his wife to mail her the introduction of Froebel's Education of Man in pamphlet form. Like the Schurz kindergarten it was in German, a language that Peabody had learned through self-study (Hewes, 1975).

Although not significant in itself, this incident indicates how the concept of formal out-of-home preschools was nurtured across the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Elizabeth Peabody had been involved with the Boston Infant schools of the 1820s. She also picked up on those aspects of the method that fit in with her youthful stint as an assistant teacher with Bronson Alcott. According to Strickland (1973), Alcott not only started child psychology in America but promoted a system of discipline that relied upon withholding affection to maintain control. When she started her Boston kindergarten in 1860, the basic system Peabody advocated combined Alcott's ideas with Wilderspin's, substituting Froebel's Gifts and Occupations for the object teaching developed in London. Even after her trip to visit European kindergartens

in 1867-8, when she recognized that her own Boston kindergarten of 1860 was just another Infant School, her interpretation of the kindergarten continued to use Wilderspin's terminology and methods. For example, even though Froebel had devised the First Gift balls and verses for mothers to use with their babies, as late as 1884 Peabody recommended that they should be used weekly for the three years children were enrolled in kindergarten and emphasized that "the object teaching upon the ball is strictly inexhaustible" (Peabody, 1884, p. 572).

In 1869, Peabody persuaded Milton Bradley to publish a manual that described the didactic use of Froebelian Gifts - the sequenced balls, boxes of little blocks, and other equipment which she believed to be essential to the kindergarten. In actuality, this manual seems to have been plagiarized by Edward Weibé from one translated from a French pamphlet by by a German gymnastics teacher named Goldammer. St. Louis kindergartner Susan Blow wrote to Peabody in 1879 to expose him as "a humbug and an ignoramous" but by that time Prang, Ernst Steiger and several other manufacturers of school supplies had joined Bradley in selling "authentic" and "improved" Froebelian equipment, together with manuals describing its use (Hewes, 1991a). Under the manual's new title of Paradise of Childhood, Bradley simply reprinted the original illustrations and directions as written by Weibé. As late as the 1921 "Jubilee Edition" the methodology continued to sound as if during the past hundred years only the materials had changed from the Wilderspin and Mayo infant schools. For example, the Third Gift consists of a cube divided into eight smaller one-inch cubes. Its presentation is described with customary detail:

> The children having taken their usual seats, the teacher addresses them as follows: -
>
> "Today, we have something new to play with."
>
> Opening the package and displaying the box, he does not at once gratify their curiosity by showing them what it contains, but commences by asking the question: -
>
> "Which of the three objects we played with yesterday does this box look like?"
>
> They answer readily, "The cube."

> "Describe the box as the cube has been described, with regard to its sides, edges, corners, etc."
> When this has been satisfactorily done, the box is placed inverted upon the table and the cover removed by drawing it out, which will allow the cubes to stand on the table.
>
> (Bradley, p. 28)

The exercise progresses as the teacher dictates to the children the movements they should make and queries them as to what they see. Using this set of eight cubes, children produce *forms of life, forms of knowledge,* and *forms of beauty* that will be repeated with gradually more complicated sets of blocks and with other Gifts that Froebel had suggested for younger children.

Peabody also believed that external pressures were required to bring to set the feet of little children in the paths of righteousness so that they should never stray. As Baylor has pointed out, rather than the kindergarten child's will being broken through harsh punishments, it was to be brought into "harmony with God's will through a lower harmony with the will of its loving and loved" (1968, p. 154). Or, to express it another way, Peabody explained that "It is Froebel's idea to give him something to do, within the possible sphere of his affection and fancy, which shall be an opportunity of his making an experience of success, that shall stimulate him to desire, and thereby make him receptive of . . . the obedience of a spiritual being" (1884, p. 562). Despite her admiration for Froebel, Peabody continued to believe that children should be controlled by external authority, using methods less punitive and threatening than those of her Puritan ancestors but perhaps more effective in bringing them under the domination of church and state, with the locus of control score would be about E++.

In contrast to Peabody and her followers, the philosophy of Internal dominance that had come from Comenius, Pestalozzi, Froebel and other European humanists was passed on in more authentic form by educators who had either grown up in Germany or Switzerland or who were predisposed to its orientation before studying there. I have written extensively and defensively about them (Hewes 1975, 1985, 1989, 1990, 1991b) and will only review them here. The Krause Seminary in New York was established by German kindergartner Maria Krause-Boelte and

Froebel associate John Krause in 1873; their extensive writings, including Kindergarten Guide (1881), document their mid-point orientation. Emma Marwedel, who had been director of a socialist-leaning girls high school in Germany, strongly influenced the California kindergarten development. Although Matilda Kriege's 1876 biography of Froebel includes extensive illustrations of Steiger's manufactured Kindergarten Gifts, her writings indicate that they were used in a non-didactic manner and she would also belong at the mid-point. German-Swiss William Hailmann, who vividly recalled his boyhood emotions when he was transferred from a school with rigid discipline to one with a Pestalozzian teacher, promoted the authentic Froebelian philosophy from the time of his first visit to Zurich kindergartens in 1857 until his death in 1920. Eudora Hailmann, his American-born wife, got her first training as a participating mother with the German-trained teacher of her children's kindergarten, then studied in Zurich in 1866 and 1871. Both William and Eudora Hailmann were involved with teacher training, program administration, countless publications and lectures, displays at world's fairs and educational conferences, and leadership in professional associations until the 1890s. Their emphasis was consistently upon IE mid-point practices of self-realization and self-control that would lead to well-balanced adults, those able to appropriately choose between circumstances in which they should be Internals and those in which they should display External characteristics. Some dependence upon authoritarian control remained, but the goal of the European trained Froebelians was at the mid-point of the scale.

By the end of the nineteenth century, advocates of the kindergartens had become aware of the philosophical differences between the those identified with Peabody's followers and the much larger but less charismatic mid-scale kindergarten advocates. Although several attempts were made within the kindergarten associations to reconcile the groups that became known as *traditionalists* and *progressives*, the kindergarten had lost its Froebelian identification. Derided by the newly popular Herbartians who favored a structured method of education and by the "scientific" child study movement, they found themselves overlooked in the assimilation of kindergartens into underfunded public schools. The normal schools and teacher training

college courses were primarily concerned with preparing students for elementary levels. Without adequate replacement by young advocates when the original Froebelians died or became inactive, the movement that had flowered so profusely in the 1880s appeared to wither at the beginning of the twentieth century. In addition, the 1916 appearance of Kilpatrick's tolerantly scornful Froebel's kindergarten principals critically examined and onset of the first World War with its anti-German propaganda meant that kindergartens no longer identified with Froebel.

Although it is beyond the stated scope of this paper, it seems appropriate to note that the mid-point orientation of the authentic Pestalozzi-Froebel method has not died out. It was incorporated into the Child Study Movement popularized by G. Stanley Hall and the Progressive Education practices of Dewey and his followers. It underlies our current emphasis upon developmentally appropriate practice and is evidenced by most of the presentations at this annual conference of the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Just as Elizabeth Peabody had carried on an interpretation of Pestalozzi learned early in the nineteenth century, so did Patty Smith Hill transmit her youthful orientation to the European version of Froebel throughout the course of a long and fruitful life. One of the "fruits" of that life was her skillful structuring of the Committee on Nursery Schools in the 1920s and her development of the organization that is now the NAEYC (Hewes, 1976).

Conclusions

Historical and biographical studies should not rely upon the labels that individuals have applied to themselves or have had applied by others. Program intent of early childhood methodology can be analyzed according to educational practices that are intended to produce Internal or External characteristics when they become adults. Use of the IE rating scale can be used to determine the underlying motivation of educational systems through time and space. Thus, the use of IE dimensions to trace Pestalozzi's influence upon Froebelian kindergartens in the United States not only justifies the title of "foster father" but explains some of the misunderstandings about the kindergarten practices and philosophy.

Assuming that the mid-point between External and Internal locus of control is the ideal early childhood philosophy, we must recognize that misinterpretation by observers and practitioners may emphasize either alternative without recognizing the need for balance between the two. Those of us who teach teachers should make sure that we communicate underlying philosophical differences that characterize the varied IE approaches to early childhood education in order to minimize the chances that our students will confuse the materials and activities with the intended locus of control.

References

Unlisted primary sources included those in the Hailmann Collection at the University of California in Los Angeles, the Association for Childhood Education International, the Froebel Institute in London, and other archival collections in the United States, Germany and Switzerland. Detailed references to the Froebel Kindergarten are in Hewes (1975).

Altfest, K. C. (1977). Robert Owen as educator. Boston: Twayne.

Baylor, R. M. (1965). Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: Kindergarten pioneer. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

Binder, F. M. (1974). The age of the common school, 1830-1865. New York: John Wiley.

Bradley, M. (Ed.) (1921). Paradise of Childhood. Springfield, MA: Milton Bradley Co.

Cubberly, E. P. (1920). Readings in the history of education. Boston: Hougton Mifflin.

Douglas, H. R. and Grieder, C. (1948). American Public Education. New York: Ronald Press.

Downs, R. B. (1978). Friedrich Froebel. Boston: Twayne.

Hewes, D. W. (1975). W. N. Hailmann: Defender of Froebel. Doctoral dissertation. Publ. # 75-15, 939, Xerox Univ. Microfilm.

Hewes, D. W. (1976). Patty Smith Hill: Pioneer for young children, in Young Children (31:4).

Hewes, D. W. (1985). ERIC/EECE ED 264980 PS015596 - Compensatory early childhood education: Froebelian origins and outcomes.

Hewes, D. W. (1989). Locus of control - A historical perpective in Delta Phi Upsilon Annual Review.

Hewes, D. W. (1990). Historical foundations of early childhood teacher training: The evolution of kindergarten teacher preparation. In B. Spodek & O. Saracho, Early Childhood Teacher Preparation. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hewes, D. W. (1991a). ERIC/EECE ED 330431 PS 01476 - Early childhood education commercial exhibit controversies, 1890-1990

Hewes, D. W. (1991b). ERIC EECE: ED 320676 PS 018861 - American Froebelians and their understanding of Comenius.

Hollis, A. P. (1898). The contribution of the Oswego Normal School to educational progress in the United States. Boston: D. C. Heath.

Krause-Boelte, M. and Kraus, J. (1881). The Kindergarten Guide. New York: E. Steiger.

Kriege, M. H. (1876). Friedrich Frœbel. New York: E. Steiger.

Montessori, M. (1966 reprint of 1914). Dr. Montessori's own handbook. Cambridge, MA: Robert Bentley.

Monroe, W. S. (1969 reprint of 1907). History of the Pestalozzian movement in the United States. New York: Arno.

Neef, J. (1808; reprint 1969). Sketch of a plan and method of education founded on an analysis of the human faculties and natural reason suitable for the offspring of a free people and for all rational beings. New York: Arno Press and New York Times.

Peabody, E. P. (1874). Lectures on the nursery and kindergarten. Philadelphia: H.N. McKinney

Peabody E. P. (1884). Froebel in the nursery. In Barnard,H. (Ed.) Kindergarten and child culture papers. Hartford: American Jl. of Education.

Peńce, A. R. (1980). Preschool programs of the nineteenth century: Towards a history of preschool child care in America. Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 41, p. 526-A, University Microfilms no. 801-7892.

Pestalozzi, J. (1827). Letters on early education - Addressed to J. P. Greaves, Esq. London: Sherwood, Gilbert, & Piper.

Pestalozzi, J. (1951). Education of man - Aphorisms. NY: Philosophical Library.

Pinloche, A. (1901). Pestalozzi and the foundation of the modern elementary school. New York: Scribner's.

Raymont, R. (1937). A History of the education of young children. New York: Longmans, Green.

Rogers, D. (1961). Oswego: Fountainhead of teacher education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Rotter, J. B., Chance, J.E., & Phares, E.J. (Eds.). (1972). Applications of a social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Seeley, L. (1904). History of education. New York: American Book Co.

Strickland, B. R. (1989). Internal-External control expectancies: From contingency to creativity. American Psychologist 44:1 (January). 1-12.

Strickland, C. (1973). Transcendentalist father: The child-rearing practices of Bronson Alcott. History of Childhood Quarterly 1:1 (Summer). 4-55.

Vág, O. (1984) Organization and educational work at the Westminster Infant Asylum in London. Proceedings, International Standing Working Group for the History of Early Childhood Education. Bamberg, FRG.

Winterer, C. (1992). Avoiding a "Hothouse System of Education": Nineteenth-century early childhood education from infant schools to the kindergartens. History of Education Quarterly. 33:3 (Fall). 298-314.